

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

WILL MCLEMORE, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	No. 3:19-cv-00530
v.)	
)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
ROXANA GUMUCIO, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Pending before the Court is Defendants’ Motion to Strike Plaintiffs’ Statement of Undisputed Material Fact (Doc. No. 101, “Motion to Strike”). On June 11, 2021, after reviewing the Motion to Strike and Plaintiffs’ response thereto (Doc. No. 103), the Court entered an Order (Doc. No. 112) expressing its views on what may be properly included in a statement of undisputed material fact, and instructing Plaintiffs to thereafter file a notice clarifying their position as to what portions of their Statement of Undisputed Material Fact (“SUMF”) they still contended, after considering the Court’s views expressed in the Order, were truly statements of undisputed material fact.

On June 21, 2021, Plaintiffs filed their “Notice of Compliance with the Court’s June 11, 2021 Order” (Doc. No. 113, “Notice”). In the Notice, Plaintiffs requested that a considerable amount of statements in their SUMF be stricken. Thereafter, Defendants filed their response to Plaintiffs’ SUMF, responding only to the statements that Plaintiffs indicated were not stricken. (Doc. No. 114, “Response to SUMF”).

In light of the Notice, the Court finds that the relief requested within Defendants’ Motion to Strike has effectively been granted. Accordingly, the pending Motion to Strike will be denied

as moot, and the Court—in deciding Plaintiff’s pending motion for summary judgment—will consider both Plaintiffs’ SUMF as it has been amended by virtue of the Notice and Defendants’ Response to SUMF.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE